

Message

Sent: 8/29/2017 12:10:58 AM
Subject: FW: ACTION: Wetlands Update to Div '17-'18 Strategic Plan
Attachments: Net Gain of Aquatic Resources Tracking 8.2017.docx; Annual Reporting NGAR.xlsx

Melissa – In addition to the annual metrics you describe in the attachment for NGAR,

- Number of draft prospectus, prospectus, and bank-enabling instruments reviewed;
- Number of mitigation site visits conducted; and
- Acreage and number of credits approved for mitigation bank and in-lieu fee programs.

Starting with our FY'18 PPRs, I would like the Workstream to capture and report annually on the following:

1. Net wetland acres authorized for loss/gain under 404 permits that are subject to PPR (where X= #acres required to be *established or reestablished* under final docs, MINUS acres of fill in final docs).
2. Same for *non-wetland* acres of waters.
3. Acres of wetlands successfully established/reestablished at “year 5” (or similar timing required by permit docs) at compensatory mitigation sites (banks or PRM) for universe of permits in #1, based on one or more EPA site visits.
4. Same for non-wetland acres of waters for universe of permits in #2.

So the number, and choice of, site visits should be guided by our PPR universe, and thus be relatively predictable for travel planning. That said, please do work with the team to estimate “typical” travel expenses we might need in a year for this, and explore what types of work (if any) here we might be able to fund through EPM contractor work. Ideally, that would be tasks that recur year-over-year so we could just keep putting some money in the WTR umbrella support contract for it. Also, consider that once data are collected

Jason A. Brush

Supervisor, Wetlands Section

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9

75 Hawthorne Street (WTR-2-4)

San Francisco, CA 94105

~~~~~

desk: 415.972.3483

~~~~~

From: Scianni, Melissa

Sent: Monday, August 21, 2017 2:56 PM

To: Brush, Jason <Brush.Jason@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: ACTION: Wetlands Update to Div '17-'18 Strategic Plan

Slight revision to the numbers. Sarvy had one prospectus that wasn't in the spreadsheet yet. Revised numbers are below. I attached my excel sheet if you want to see the break down by District. I also attached the short tracking write up I did for the Workstream.

The Workstream is also working on writing up considerations for CRAM use in banks/ILFs (mostly for internal use, but also to share with the Corps). We're looking at this as an informal stop gap document until the Tech Memo gets updated. I'm planning to have something for you by my end of year.

Prospectus- Reviewed 10 (100%)

Draft BEI- Reviewed 7 (100%)

Final BEI- Signed 1 (100%)

"In FY17, we received 10 prospectuses and reviewed 100%. We acted on 100% of final bank instruments (n= 1)."

Thanks,
Melissa

Melissa Scianni
Wetlands Office
US EPA, Region IX, Southern CA Field Office
600 Wilshire Blvd, Suite 1460
Los Angeles, CA 90017
(213) 244-1817
scianni.melissa@epa.gov

From: Scianni, Melissa
Sent: Monday, August 21, 2017 9:23 AM
To: Brush, Jason <Brush.Jason@epa.gov>; Goldmann, Elizabeth <Goldmann.Elizabeth@epa.gov>; Leidy, Robert <Leidy.Robert@epa.gov>; Ross, Brian <Ross.Brian@epa.gov>
Cc: ROSETTI, LEANA <Rosetti.Leana@epa.gov>; Siu, Jennifer <Siu.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Morgan, Joseph <Morgan.Joseph@epa.gov>; Fitzgerald, Megan <fitzgerald.megan@epa.gov>; Mahdavi, Sarvy <Mahdavi.Sarvy@epa.gov>; Ota, Allan <Ota.Allan@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: ACTION: Wetlands Update to Div '17-'18 Strategic Plan

Hi Jason,

Below are the review numbers for the NGAR Workstream.

Prospectus- Reviewed 9 (100%)
Draft BEI- Reviewed 7 (100%)
Final BEI- Signed 1 (100%)

"In FY17, we received 9 prospectuses and reviewed 100%. We acted on 100% of final bank instruments (n= 1)."

There is one pending final BEI and one ILF amendment (to add a site) pending in SPL, those may be signed by the end of FY. I can update the numbers if those get approved in Sept.

Thanks,
Melissa

Melissa Scianni
Wetlands Office
US EPA, Region IX, Southern CA Field Office
600 Wilshire Blvd, Suite 1460
Los Angeles, CA 90017
(213) 244-1817
scianni.melissa@epa.gov

From: Brush, Jason
Sent: Tuesday, August 01, 2017 1:24 PM
To: Goldmann, Elizabeth <Goldmann.Elizabeth@epa.gov>; Leidy, Robert <Leidy.Robert@epa.gov>; Ross, Brian <Ross.Brian@epa.gov>; Scianni, Melissa <Scianni.Melissa@epa.gov>
Cc: ROSETTI, LEANA <Rosetti.Leana@epa.gov>; Siu, Jennifer <Siu.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Morgan, Joseph

<Morgan.Joseph@epa.gov>; Fitzgerald, Megan <fitzgerald.megan@epa.gov>; Mahdavi, Sarvy <Mahdavi.Sarvy@epa.gov>; Ota, Allan <Ota.Allan@epa.gov>

Subject: ACTION: Wetlands Update to Div '17-'18 Strategic Plan

Importance: High

Dear WCs: As I mentioned at last week's Section Meeting, the Division is updating the 2-yr Div Strategic Plan for progress on our commitments, and any adjustments that we might foresee for the '18 portion. I need your help for our part and I've excerpted the portion specific to our Section, below. Please see my rough start and prompts in Red, think about the updates under your workstream, and look for a calendar invite from me soon to get together and finalize. Thanks – JB

- Review 12-15 new high impact CWA 404 permits and NEPA documents, including Habitat Conservation Plans in Sacramento and Placer Counties, CA High Speed Rail, and several SF Bay projects, Provide comment as appropriate. (FY17).
 - Liz: Need to pull DARTER numbers for overall reviews, but consider what subset we consider "high impact" pursuant to the review criteria you drafted a while ago; NEPA we will need to think through how we count. The HCP documents are going to be '18 actions, and Joe could provide you with updated milestone dates for SSHCP and PCCP.
- Resolve CWA 404(q) elevation actions between EPA and the Army Corps for Rosemont Mine (March), the CA "Water Fix" (June 2017), and the Cordova Hills housing development near Sacramento. May include providing support to ENF if Rosemont and/or CA Water Fix are referred to CEQ (December 2017).
 - Liz: The CH recission was completed (date). Water Fix needs a timeline update (from Jen and/or Erin F). Rosemont Mine we'll just bump out another 6-months, I suppose (I'll call Division, but suspect decision timing will remain a WAG).
- Complete Region 9's draft CWA jurisdictional determination for the Redwood City Cargill site (November 2016).
 - Done, on here because it was an early FY'17 action.
- Solicit proposals, make selections, and disperse funds for the 2017-18 Wetlands Program Development Grants (WPDG), estimated at approximately \$3M (Q3, FY17)
 - Done. Thanks to Leana for the summary doc, which I can use to craft something here.
- Process Programmatic 401 water quality certification on behalf of tribes for the Corps 2017-2022 "Nationwide" general permit program, including tribal outreach and consultations as necessary (Q2, FY17).
 - Done. I'll write a sentence with the date of TT's letter.
- Review 90% of prospectuses for new mitigation bank/ILF programs; act on 100% of final Bank Enabling Instruments (FY17/18).
 - Melissa: need data. "In FY17, we received ____ # prospectuses and reviewed ____%. We acted on ____% of final bank instruments (n=____)."
- Improve tracking and reporting of beneficial reuse of dredged materials (FY17/18).
 - Brian: As discussed at our last update, need a short narrative on what we're doing and what's next.
- Improve tracking of compensatory mitigation and environmental outcomes (FY17/18).
 - Melissa: We discussed the priority workstream task shifting to crediting methods, and that certainly fits with "outcomes" here. But we should talk about what we might be able to say about tracking, too. I think there was a RIBITS update I missed while on vacay (which I know wasn't our lead), and maybe we can talk about that or similar actions we've collaborated on with partners. Also, can we

say "Based on current and prior EPA action on BEIs, X acres of restored or newly established aquatic resources became available in FY17 to offset permitted impacts"??

- Issue sediment suitability determinations for disposal of dredged material at designated ocean disposal sites and/or other suitable locations for the following (FY17):
 - Northern California: 50 to 100 projects
 - Southern California: 50 to 100 projects
 - Pacific Islands: 10 to 15 projects
- ~ **Brian:** These are per-year numbers, so we should be in the ballpark for '17. It appears that OD concurrences got edited out (not by me). Let's compile the above numbers on S/NUAD (and add OD concurrences back in), and discuss.
- Initiate rule-making process and conduct supporting studies for possible expansion of the Humboldt Open Ocean Disposal Site. Implement ocean disposal site monitoring as appropriate (FY17).
 - ~ **Brian:** As discussed at our update, need a short narrative on what we're doing and what's next.
- Conduct ocean disposal site monitoring at the San Francisco and Los Angeles Deep Ocean Disposal Sites, including making appropriate logistical arrangements, performing monitoring, funding lab analysis, and reporting findings (Q4, FY17).
 - ~ **Brian:** Just need a short blurb on shift of resources to HI to take advantage of funding, and a statement on our SFDODS plans. Total dollar amt in marine protection funds to the survey, lab and reporting categories would be helpful.

Disinvestments

- Involvement in the Coral Reef Task Force, R9 Coral Strategy, and other coral science due to retirement of WTR-2-4 expert. While issues surrounding coral reefs continue to be a concern for the division, these functions will be reevaluated in FY17 and assigned to other section(s) (April 2017).
 - ~ **Brian:** We have no CRTF rep in the section anymore, so that part's easy. But a line or two on our section's ongoing role, if any, in the R9 coral strategy might be good to update here (even if it's just to refine the "disinvestment" statement). Updating (as needed) this R9 strategy was a task for Hudson Slay in coordination with LND, and I can try to check in with him on this front.
- Case-by-case jurisdictional reviews will be reduced by approximately 50% due to uncertainty with Clean Water Rule and policy responses to the Hawkes Decision (April 2017).
 - ~ **Rob:** With WOTUS2, AZ x-program issues, and CA rule, I need to craft a statement basically reversing this...no JDs should go by without scrutiny, especially AZ. Let's talk about how to make this work.